DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 221 419 SO 014 142

AUTHOR Earle, David D.
TITLE Allan Kownslar and the New Social Studies.
PUB DATE 12 Feb 82
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association (Austin, TX, February, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Development; *Educational Change; *Educational History; Educational Trends; Inquiry; Relevance (Education); Secondary Education; Skill Development; Social Problems; *Social Studies; Textbook Content; Textbook Evaluation; United States Government (Course); United States History
IDENTIFIERS *Kownslar (Allan O); New Social Studies

ABSTRACT

An examination of the secondary social studies textbooks written by Allan O. Kownslar from 1967 to 1980 reflects several of the major themes that have shaped social studies education since the sixties. The paper briefly surveys the political and pedagogical events that stimulated the proliferation of social studies curriculum projects in the 1960s. Then it examines Kownslar's work in detail. Criticism of the social studies curriculum in the 1950s and the early 1960s led to the creation of a number of social studies curriculum projects advocating a social science centered, inquiry approach to social studies and history. Kownslar's first major text, "Discovering American History" (1967), was written in the style of the project materials, emphasizing inquiry skills. However, over the years his texts changed to incorporate features to enhance the relevance of history and government for students and to foster their mastery of basic academic skills. A transition from scientific inquiry to basic information mixed with more reflected inquiry can be detected. His more recent texts appealed to the eclecticism in teachers. For example, "The Americans" (1970), reflected a growing sensitivity to the problems of the poor and the minority groups in the 1960s. In his seventh grade Texas history text "The Texans," he combined features of both traditional and inquiry texts. Although the text, "People and Our World" did contain a number of inquiry oriented features, teachers could use entirely traditional methods with the text. The same could be said about Kownslar's most recent text "American Government" (1980). (RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED221419

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
David D. Earle
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ALLAN KOWNSLAR AND THE NEW SOCIAL STUDIES

David D. Earle
University of Texas at Austin
February 12, 1982

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, Austin, February 1982

SO 014 142

ABSTRACT

Allan O. Kownslar is one of the most prolific authors of secondary social studies textbooks at work in the United States today. An examination of his texts written since 1967, reflect several of the major themes that have shaped social studies education since the sixties. Criticism of the social studies curriculum in the 1950's and early 1960's led to the creation of a number of social studies curriculum projects advocating a social science centered, inquiry approach to social studies and history. Kownslar's first major text., Discovering American History (1967) was written in the style of the project materials, however, over the years his texts changed to incorporate features to enhance the relevance of history and government for students and to foster their mastery of basic academic skills.

Introduction

In the early 1960's, Allan Kownslar was teaching American History to eighth graders in Amherst, Massachusetts. One day he gave his classes a chart containing a list of United States Senators by state in 1812, and their vote on the resolution to declare war on Great Britain. The students wrestled with these seemingly meager bits of data and derived every major hypothesis modern historians use to explain the causes of the War of 1812.[1] Kownslar was impressed. In the weeks and months that followed he devoted more and more time to developing lessons which utilized primary source material. One summer he typed 2000 "dittos" so that his students could have lessons rich in primary materials. These lessons became the basis for Kownslar's first major textbook, Discovering American History, which he wrote with Don Frizzle for publication in 1967.

Kownslar and Frizzle had written a text for junior high history students utilizing a combination of primary and secondary source material which forced students to use inductive thinking strategies and analytical skills to solve historical problems. Kownslar was not a curriculum theorist; he was a teacher who found that the inductive-problem solving approach worked in his classroom. Nevertheless, Discovering American History was an example of the type of material being produced by numerous federally funded social studies curriculum projects located around the country.

Edwin Fenton, in an April 1965 article in Social Education coined the term "The New Social Studies" to describe these projects because they had several important and common characteristics:

1. Jerome Bruner's idea that any concept could be taught in an intellectually honest way at any level provided the underlying philosophy.

2. They advocated the inquiry-discovery approach to instruction.

3. The projects were subject centered and experts in the various social sciences and history provided guidance in their development.

4. Students were trained to solve problems as "junior historians, sociologists, or anthropologists, etc.

5. The projects utilized a wide variety of materials and audio-visual aids which had been field tested before distribution. (Fenton and Good, 1965).

The projects began to distribute materials to large numbers of classrooms in 1966 and 1967. When Discovering American History appeared, innovative teachers and schools were eager to experiment with the new materials being produced by the projects and authors like Allan Kownslar. However, ten years later, "The New Social Studies" had not had an appreciable effect on social studies classrooms (Stake and Easley, 1978; Wiley with Race, 1977). The specific reasons the social studies projects failed to transform social studies instruction in the 1970's would be difficult to pinpoint. Organizational histories of the various projects would need to be written, and extensive interviews with teachers who used the materials, and those who did not, would need to be conducted. Another method which could be used

to indirectly assess the impact of The New Social Studies on teachers and curriculum developers and to chart the ebb and flow of educational philosophy since 1967, would be to study the work of a prominent curriculum developer who was committed to the principles of The New Social Studies and whose career has spanned much of the last two decades. Allan Kownslar and his work meet these criteria.

The New Social Studies

Although Allan Kownslar's textbook was not the product of one of the social studies curriculum projects, an atmosphere or attitude existed in education circles that made it possible for Discovering American History to be published. Therefore, before examining Kownslar's work in detail it is important to briefly survey the political and pedagogical events that stimulated the proliferation of social studies curriculum projects in the 1960's.

The impetus for reform in the social studies can be traced to the criticism of the public schools voiced in the 1950's by Arthur Bestor (1955) who complained that the schools were not being used to provide the intellectual training American youth needed and deserved, nor the training a democratic society demanded. Bestor accused the schools of being anti-intellectual, and incapable of training young minds with the degree of intellectual rigor required in the world of 1955. He was not alone. Admiral Rickover echoed many of Bestor's

complaints. Rudolf Flesch wrote Why Johnny Can't Read: And What You Can Do About It in 1955, and Douglas Bush complained that the study of foreign languages was declining in the United States because "modern American Pedagogy avoids work" (Haas, 1977, p. 3). This was severe criticism in light of Senator Benton's report on Soviet Education in which he described a contemporary Sparta, where students worked especially hard in mathematics and science.

The Council for Basic Education was organized in 1956. Its members bemoaned the fact that American schools were not training sufficient numbers of engineers and mathematicians, and they criticized the curriculum as being "soft" and "outdated" (Goodlad, 1966). The launching of Sputnik in October, 1957, seemed to confirm the worst fears of critics of American schools. The nation's pride had been wounded and the public school was the scapegoat. Fortunately, the school was also seen as the source of salvation (Goodlad, 1966).

Several curriculum reform movements that had been instigated several years earlier were given greater attention. Work revising the mathematics curriculum had begun at the University of Illinois in 1951, and the Physical Science Study Committee had been organized before Sputnik had been launched. In fact, by 1957, six national curriculum projects in math and science had published materials, and guidelines for additional projects had been established.

Critics of the schools were also concerned about the quality of social studies education. So called "life adjustment" curricula had dismayed conservative Americans who were demanding "citizenship training." They expected the "American Creed" to be transmitted in traditional history and civics courses (Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977). Academic historians, like Arthur Bestor, wanted more sophisticated and rigorous history courses while social scientists advocated more courses in the social sciences and greater use of social science methods in all social studies classrooms (Wiley and Race, 1977).

Leaders in social studies education were not responsive to these demands. In the 1950 National Council for the Social Studies Yearbook, Theory and Practice in the Social Studies, Earl Johnson had attempted to translate Dewey's notions of problem solving and reflection into a systematic curriculum. Five years later Maurice Hunt and Lawrence Metcalf argued that the social studies should organize around exploration of the "closed areas of society - sex, patriotism, morality, race, that are clouded with ignorance, superstition, and controversy" (Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977, p. 36). In 1957, the NCSS issued a fourteen point statement of goals for the social studies emphasizing education that would encourage efficient use of human and natural resources, instill appreciation for the dignity and worth of individuals, and promote understanding of the rights and responsibilities of citizenship (Wiley and Race, 1977).

NCSS yearbooks in 1955 (Ellsworth and Sand) and 1958 (Price), considered the role of the social sciences in social studies education. In both yearbooks the social sciences were viewed as useful sources of information, but they were not considered suitable organizing centers for social studies curricula. As late as 1961, when the mathematics and science projects were well underway Charles Keller (1961) saw no chance for reform in the social studies. Reflective thought, open and rational discussion of controversial topics, and the cultivation of humane, responsible citizens were valid goals for social studies programs, but they did not satisfy the critics. Even advocates of "citizenship training" were not particularly interested in developing "reflective thinking skills."

The first attempts to reform social studies instruction in the mold of what was to become known as The New Social Studies were small personal projects. Lawrence Senesh worked to foster concepts from economics in primary students during the late 1950's and early 1960's. Edwin Fenton experimented with primary source material in secondary history classes (Haas, 1977). Both programs succeeded, in large part, because of the energy and dedication of Professors Senesh and Fenton. The idea that a first grader could learn important concepts in economics, or even that a high school junior could derive generalizations from primary source materials, was somewhat novel. Then, in 1960, Brumer's The Process of Education was published. It provided theoretical

support for Senesh's and Fenton's projects. Brumer believed that a student would learn and understand a given fact or concept with greater efficiency if it were related to a "structure." He described "structure" as a set of assumptions and a pattern of inquiry students could use to solve problems in a specific discipline. Teach the student to use the pattern of inquiry and develop the necessary, complementary critical thinking skills, and the student had a valuable tool for learning. Bruner felt that even primary grade children could begin to learn a pattern of inquiry and consequently, any major concept could be taught, in some form, at any level. The apparent simplicity of Bruner's ideas made them attractive, and most new curriculum projects attempted to organize around the "structure" of a discipline.

Because of this new-found belief in disciplines as organizing centers for school subjects, many mathematicians, and social and physical scientists became involved in curriculum development. In the social studies professional associations of geographers, sociologists, and anthropologists each established curriculum projects to promote their discipline in the curricula of secondary schools. None of the projects attempted to reorganize the entire social studies curriculum or stimulate other major reforms. For example, the first history project, The Amherst Project, produced a series of two-week units using primary source material from American History. The units could be used separately, in sequence, or as supplements to existing courses

of study (Haas, 1977). These first projects were funded privately but in 1962, the United States Office of Education invited proposals for social studies curriculum projects and within the year it funded seven curriculum centers, eleven research projects and two development activities (Haas, 1977).

The NCSS began to take note of the projects in the early 1960's. In 1962, in cooperation with the American Council of Learned Societies, it published a series of papers advocating greater emphasis on social science methods and content in social studies classrooms. However, the NCSS yearbooks in 1961, Interpreting and Teaching American History (Cartwright and Watson) and Helen McCracken Carpenter's Skill Development in the Social Studies ignored the inquiry and critical thinking skills the projects hoped to foster. The projects were first mentioned in Social Education in 1963 (Haas, 1977), but it was not until Fenton's 1965 article, that they received significant coverage in the principal publication of the NCSS.

John Goodlad (1966) lauded the projects:

> "Nearly all projects propose to afford students an opportunity to explore, invent and discover; to develop some of the tools of inquiry appropriate to the field; and to experience some of the feelings and satisfactions of research scholars. A more distant aim is to prepare the student for intellectual and academic survival in a complex, scientific world." (p. 92).

Critics demanding more rigor and more social science in the social studies praised the projects. Even advocates of "citizenship training" were willing to give the projects a chance to effect reform.

However, the projects had many legitimate critics.

In 1962, Lewis Todd explained that it was imperative to develop a clear understanding of our fellow man as our technologies became more and more complex. He warned that the narrow focus of specific social sciences could impede rather than enhance understanding. Shirley Engle (1963) suggested that the proper concerns of the social studies, the recurring problems facing all cultures, transcend the boundaries of any one social science. McCutcheon (1963) agreed, he felt the social studies could be understood as a discipline with its own pattern of inquiry. Robinson (1963) argues, that in any case, educators must attend first to the needs of students and only then to the demands of a discipline. He pointed out that there are several legitimate approaches to the study of hisotry and that teachers must not be pressured by an educational fad to train "junior historians." Krug (1970), like Robinson, was concerned that strict devotion to methods of social science inquiry would not meet either the needs of the student or the society at large. Inquiry approaches might not provide the most efficient learning strategies for all students and the dispassionate, objective methods of science would not always help students make responsible decisions as citizens. Bellack complained that the projects failed to offer any substantive proposals for reforming the scope and sequence of social studies curriculum. In fact, he argued that the narrow focus of many of the projects

prohibited inquiry into broad areas of human endeavor or analysis of major policy decisions (Haas, 1977).

Edwin Fenton recognized the validity of many of these criticisms. In The New Social Studies (1967), he called for a coherent social studies curriculum that would extend across grades and subjects. He recognized the need to meet college requirements, to respond to community pressures, to win the confidence of teachers, to respect the different needs of students, to allow for the discussion of values, and to disseminate traditional historical information. In short, he understood that any history or government course had to conform to certain community expectations if it were to be adopted. His book illustrated ways that new inquiry oriented materials could be used to achieve traditional goals.

As late as 1967, when funding for the various social studies projects was reaching a peak and new materials were becoming generally available, life in social studies classrooms was changing very little. Aside from innovations like "post-holing" and team teaching which occurred occasionally, lecture and discussion dominated instruction (Wiley and Race, 1977). Ratcliffe (1966) and Brufke (1972) found attention to social science concepts to be "inadequate," and Palmer (1967) found social studies texts to be heavy, organized chronologically, devoid of inquiry activities, and lacking in analysis based on information from the social sciences.

Significant changes, however, should not have been expected. Project materials were only beginning to reach teachers in 1967. Opponents of The New Social Studies continued to argue for broader, less scientific approaches to social education, and neither camp was capable of overcoming the forces and pedagogical inertia present in American classrooms. The ideas advocated by proponents of The New Social Studies would require time to influence classroom practice in any significant way. Thus, while the criticisms of American schools in the 1950's spawned the social studies projects, and the debate over their value was most intense in the 1960's, measuring the impact of the projects would have to wait until the 1970's.

Allan Kownslar became an important exponent of The New Social Studies with the publication of Discovering American History in 1967. Kownslar was committed to an inquiry approach to social education in 1967, and he retains this commitment today. Nevertheless, his recent texts bear slight resemblance to Discovering American History. The metamorphosis of Kownslar's work is an indication of both the declining influence of the social studies projects and their legacies in the 1970's and 1980's.

Alan Kownslar and the New Social Studies

Dr. Allan O. Kownslar is currently a history professor at his alma mater, Trinity University in San Antonio. He graduated from Trinity in 1957, with majors in history and government, and he immediately accepted a position teaching junior high school history in San Antonio. While teaching, Kownslar continued his studies and by 1960, he had earned a Master of Arts degree in government from Trinity.

Following a dispute with the San Antonio administration over the existance of segregated professional teacher associations, Kownslar joined his friend, Don Frizzle, teaching history in Amherst, Massachusetts. Amherst was an intellectual "hotbed" of sorts. It was the home of Amherst College and the University of Massachusetts, and it was "just down the road" from Harvard and MIT. Jerome Bruner was only the most famous scholar in the area who was taking a serious interest in the problems of education. Kownslar was invited to meet with professional historians Peter Schrag, Van Halsey, Richard Brown, Henry Steel Commager and others to discuss history education. The first of the social studies projects - the Amherst Project grew out of these meetings. Kownslar eventually wrote two units for the Amherst Project, one about the Progressive Era (1970), and the other on Manifest Destiny (1967).

Needless to say, the atmosphere around Amherst in the early 1960's was invigorating for a young scholar and teacher. PSSC physics and SMSG mathematics were being implemented and the Amherst Project in

social studies was getting underway; the spirit of innovation was alive in the schools. Without the intellectual stimulation or the innovative atmosphere in Amherst, Kownslar would probably not have had the energy to develop the lessons that became Discovering American History.

The book was an immediate financial success. It sold more copies in the first weeks of its issue than Holt, Rinehart, and Winston had anticipated selling in five years. Apparently, the format and the underlying philosophy of the text attracted buyers awaiting the arrival of "The New Social Studies." In his "Note to the Teacher", in Discovering American History, Richard Brown asked, "What do we mean when we say students should study history?" His answer was an excellent example of the thought of the proponents of The New Social Studies.

> It has been said that students should 'learn' what historians have written about the past as distilled into second and third-hand accounts by the writers of textbooks. It is perhaps the least logical answer of all...It makes far more sense...to ask students to play the role of scholar, discovering for themselves the relationships which form the basic structure of the discipline, sharing the excitement of inquiry and learning, in the process, the methods of inquiry which will serve them through life...It might be more appropriate to base a 'history' course on a definition of history as either the study of the past or of how historians work or of both. It would be less useful to view history as the writings of historians about the past. (p. XV).

Kownslar's "Note to the Student' explained how students who use Discovering American History will, in fact, play the role of scholar by learning a pattern of inquiry. He described the need to interpret historical events from a "partial record," to develop and test hypotheses, and to draw conclusions in order to understand history.

The "Note" concluded with an obligatory sounding reference to citizenship training. Kownslar explained that citizens must be able to understand and interpret events, appreciate one's heritage, and make informed decisions in matters of public policy. At first glance, this comment appeared designed to appease advocates of citizenship education, but on closer analysis of the text students were frequently asked to evaluate policy decisions, judge human behavior, and clarify personal values. Kownslar's text was written to facilitate a scientific-inquiry approach to the study of history, but the reflective-inquiry requirements of social studies curricula were not ignored.

Brief summaries of a few of the lessons in Discovering American History illustrate the general format of the text and the inquiry skills Kownslar hoped to foster. The introductory lessons on the Age of Exploration were typical. Toscanelli's Map, Prester John's Letter, and excerpts from The Travels of Sir John Mandeville piqued student interest while posing an important question for study, "What did Europeans believe about the world beyond Europe, and how did their beliefs influence their actions?" Students were then confronted with modern maps showing routes of exploration, explorer reports, and maps from the Age of Exploration. Students could study where the explorers went, what they found, and how these discoveries affected future explorations without memorizing lists of names, dates, and places. These primary sources allowed students to study the Exploration as a process and then answer the question "How do man's beliefs determine his actions?"

Kownslar also used this introductory series of lessons to help students consider the process of studying and writing history. Students were given two standard textbook descriptions of the Exploration and they were asked to compare the text accounts with each other and their own interpretation of the primary source materials. The unit concluded with the question, "What is history?"

Other units followed the same pattern. Washington's presidency was described primarily through letters written by Washington and his contemporaries. Students evaluated Washington as a leader based on these letters, focusing on his style, beliefs, and concerns. The unit on Westward Expansion combined primary and secondary source material. Kownslar described the military and political manuvering that resulted in specific land acquisitions, and then he turned to accounts of frontier life written by pioneers and texts of political speeches urging expansion. Students explained why expansion occurred. The facts of expansion took a "backseat" to the explanation, although one required the other. One section of the unit on the Industrial Revolution asked students to consider, "How do values change? Did our value system change?" Students read statements by John D. Rockefeller and Andrew Carnegie on the rights and responsibilities of property owners. They also read descriptions of efforts by government to control big business in the late nineteenth century. Students reflected on the continuing clash between the rights of property owners and the needs of the community and compared the arguments of 1890 to the attitudes of modern Americans.

Discovering American History was a challenging text. It demanded both sophisticated reading and thinking skills of students, and it required teachers with an excellent foundation in American History. Sales of Discovering American History remained strong for several years, but Wiley and Race (1977) indicate the regularities of life in social studies classrooms had not changed significantly between 1965 and 1970. Kownslar's text and the other inquiry oriented materials had not influenced practice. In addition, national events in the late 1960's forced teachers to grapple with problems in the society that scientific-inquiry oriented New Social Studies materials did not address adequately. Urban problems, racial tensions, assassinations, the Viet Nam War, and disgruntled youth marked a period in which traditional concepts of order were challenged. Reflective-inquiry, problem solving strategies were called for if social studies was to be "relevant" to students of the 1960's.

In 1967, Edwin Fenton invited Kownslar to Carnegie-Mellon University in Pittsburgh to work toward a doctor's degree. Fenton had shifted his attention from designing curricula for the academically able to the special needs of "slow learners." After working with capable, well motivated students, Fenton was shocked by the open hostility of many slow students who found history irrelevant and useless (Krug, Poster, and Gillies, 1970). Kownslar's job would be to lead a team of master teachers from the Pittsburgh schools in the development of American History materials for slow learners. The results provided the basis

for Kownslar's dissertation and a text for slow learners, The Americans (Fenton and Kownslar, 1970).

Professor Fenton established four goals for the project:

1. Design materials and exercises that will promote success and enhance self-concept.
2. Design materials which will produce an improved attitude toward learning.
3. Help students clarify their concept of "the good life" and "the good society."
4. Teach basic social studies skills: reading, writing, listening, using charts and graphs, and viewing (Krug, Poster, and Gillies, 1970).

These goals represent a distinct departure from the mainstream of The New Social Studies movement. Knowledge of history was of secondary importance; history was only a vehicle for accomplishing certain academic and affective objectives. And while many activities in The Americans were inquiry oriented, inquiry skills were not considered as important as the basic study skills. The authors also emphasized values and valuing as they attempted to relate historical events and trends to the personal concerns of the student.

The first unit in The Americans focused on the Age of Exploration and it is typical of other units in the text. In many instances, historical details were sacrificed to create a bond between student and explorer, and to provide materials slow students could use effectively. The unit consisted of over twenty lessons or exercises that students could complete in under twenty minutes. Each reading was accompanied by a workbook assignment intended to provide additional skill building exercises which would also reinforce the concepts found in the lessons.

In the unit on the Exploration students were asked to consider the "knowns" and "unknowns" in their own lives in order to better identify with Columbus as he ventured into the "unknown." Students were helped to understand Columbus' unknowns through maps, adapted primary sources, and hypothetical letters and diaries. In the course of the unit students responded to lower level comprehension questions, and wrote sentences and brief paragraphs describing their feelings about various "knowns" and "unknowns." Thus, most of the goals set forth by Fenton were met; the lessons helped students relate to an historical figure, respond to a recurring theme in human affairs, and practice basic academic skills.

Each unit focused on at least one important theme or concept that students could relate to their own experiences. The unit on the colonial period asked students to consider why families in modern America move from one town to another and to compare their answers to reasons the colonists came to America. In the same unit, the lifestyles of slaves, indentured servants, farmers, and planters were examined and students considered the role of work in society. Students considered the concepts of "rebellion" and "obligation" in the unit on the American Revolution. A teenager's desire to be free of parental restrictions was compared with the wishes of many colonists to be free of English rule, and obligations to family, friends, and strangers were compared to obligations felt by colonists and revolutionary soldiers.

Discovering American History and The Americans represented two entirely different approaches to history education. The former was a

rigorous text designed to stimulate inquiry into important historical problems, the latter was interested in helping poor students achieve success in school, reflect on a few basic themes in human affairs, and build basic academic skills. Discovering American History, like the other New Social Studies materials, was a response to the "inadequate" history courses of the 1950's, while The Americans resulted from a growing sensitivity to the problems of the poor and minority groups that developed in the 1960's. Kownslar was significantly influenced by his work and experiences in Pittsburgh. From this point forward, his texts would attend much more to skill building and affective questions than had Discovering American History.

However, this was the general trend in the social studies as the 1970's dawned. In 1971, the NCSS issued a new statement of goals which could be reduced to two admonitions:

1. Design activities which will encourage involvement by relating content to the lives of students. Use a wide variety of resources and instructional styles.
2. Use carefully selected objectives, help students direct their study, and use systematic, comprehensive evolution techniques (Wiley and Race, 1977).

These goals were a rejection of the scientific-inquiry approach to social studies and an acceptance of the kinds of goals Fenton had established for The Americans.

However, Kownslar was not ready to desert the scientific-inquiry approach entirely. After completing his work at Carnegie-Mellon, he returned to Texas to write a seventh grade Texas History text, The Texans

(1972). This text was unique in that it alternated chapters of straightforward narrative concerning an era of Texas History and chapters containing primary source material. The exercises that accompanied the narrative chapters stressed recalling, comprehending, and comparing skills. The chapters containing primary source material required students to use more complex inquiry skills. Kownslar hoped that students and teachers would learn and practice the following pattern of inquiry:

1. Recognize a problem.
2. Develop an hypothesis which will answer or solve the problem.
3. Analyze, evaluate, and interpret the data.
4. Formulate generalizations.
5. Synthesize the generalizations into a logical scheme.

The entire book was well illustrated and it contained excellent maps, charts, and graphs. Each chapter was accompanied by specific skill building exercises. His experience in Pittsburgh had demonstrated to Kownslar the importance of building vocabulary, determining the main idea, reading maps, analyzing pictures, drawing comparisons, conducting polls, writing paragraphs, and other basic academic skills.

The Texans had attempted to combine features of both traditional and inquiry texts. In fact, Kownslar hoped to seduce teachers who preferred traditional teaching methods into using a more inquiry oriented approach to history. Kownslar also brought to The Texans several lessons he had learned at Carnegie-Mellon. Many students need help and practice performing basic academic tasks and others need motivation. In order to make Texas History more relevant to students, as in The Americans, inquiry exercises

tended to focus on questions of lifestyle or value in hopes of helping students establish emotional bonds with historical figures.

Kownslar's experiences in Amherst, at Carnegie-Mellon, and in writing The Texans all contributed to an emerging philosophy of social studies instruction that he was able to express as editor of the 1974 NCSS Yearbook, Teaching American History: The Quest for Relevancy. In the introductory chapter he described "the old social studies" as courses that required memorization of isolated facts that could be easily learned and just as easily forgotten. "The new social studies" of the sixties emphasized the use of inquiry techniques to develop hypotheses and analyze data to arrive at generalizations about human behavior. However, Kownslar's "new, new social studies" would,

> Impel students to question, express interest, experience empathy, or seek to analyze objectively and clarify their own values or those held by others, past and present...(and) assist students in their continuing adjustment to the world of tomorrow, the study of American History should arouse those questions that serve to cope with both old and new ideas, movements, and developments. (p. 7).

Thus, Kownslar advocated the methods of social studies projects while suggesting that the product of inquiry be clarification of one's personal values. The chapters in the yearbook were sample lesson plans illustrating his these. In one lesson students established criteria for evaluating presidential candidates, a second explored the emotions experienced by a family whose son had gone to war, and a third lesson required students to clarify their views on the roles of women in society. All the lessons utilized primary source material, and all the lessons hoped to make the

facts of history relevant to modern students.

The goal of "relevance" in social studies was a product of the events and turmoil of the late sixties. Many schools instituted various "problems" courses and/or ethnic study courses in addition to the traditional history and government courses. Even the traditional courses devoted more and more time to controversial issues, but as attention to pollution, women's rights, gun control, draft resistance, and other such issues increased attention to the traditional decreased. The result was a cry for a "return to basics." Kownslar's major texts of the late seventies reflected the general concern for "basic information," but they also included scientific-inquiry activities, skill building exercises, and "relevant" value clarification exercises.

People and Our World (1977), written with Terry Smart was a world history text aimed at the average student. It probably had more in common with The Americans than Kownslar's more sophisticated Texas and American History texts. Each chapter was prefaced with a list of specific knowledge objectives, main ideas were in boldface type, difficult words were accompanied by a phonetic spelling, and each chapter was divided into brief readings followed by a series of basic recall, comprehension questions. In addition the text included chapters on maps and map reading, and on writing term papers.

People, however, did contain a number of inquiry oriented features. Each set of study questions contained at least one question which required

higher level thought. This question typically helped students relate historical events to their own experiences. Pictures, picture essays, maps, and charts and graphs were usually accompanied by open ended questions requiring interpretation and analysis. As with the study questions, students were asked to relate past to present. For example, a question following a picture essay on Renaissance art asked, "Who are the patrons of art in your society?" Finally, each unit of three or four chapters contained a brief series of primary documents designed to help students practice various inquiry skills.

Despite these concessions to the scientific and reflective inquiry traditions, the inquiry activities were peripheral to the text. Unlike Kownslar's earlier texts, teachers could use entirely "traditional" methods when People and Our World was their principal text. The same could be said about Kownslar's most recent text, American Government (Kownslar and Smart, 1980).

American Government, like its predecessors, contained questions and activities designed to develop basic reading, comprehension, and writing skills. Indeed, the list of study skill objectives listed in the teacher's manual were virtually identical to those listed in The Texans. The text itself, as in People and Our World, was primarily narrative, but each chapter contained at least one inquiry activity and additional inquiry activities were described in the teacher's

manual. Kownslar emphatically promoted American Government as an "inquiry text," although the inquiry activities were qualitatively different from those in his earliest texts. American Government did not take a political science approach or a problems approach to government as most inquiry oriented government texts had done. Instead Kownslar posed questions typical citizens might discuss: Shouldn't it be easier to pass a law? Shouldn't there be a way to remove an incompetent judge from the Supreme Court? Should we hold a national primary? or Should our welfare system be reformed? Taken with a text designed to provide the information a citizen would need to know to be an intelligent, active participant in the community, these questions, and others, attempted to make political problems and process relevant to average government students.

Conclusions

With the publication of American Government, Allan Kownslar had all but deserted the scientific-inquiry camp of social studies educators. In 1967, he would not have considered writing a government text primarily intended to simply provide the average student with the information needed to become an effective citizen. However, the transition from scientific-inquiry to basic information mixed with more reflective inquiry was, in many respects, the result of the changing demands of the marketplace. Kownslar's textbooks may be considered the product of the interaction of an evolving philosophy

of social studies education and the demands of classroom teachers. The gradual reduction of primary source material in Kownslar's texts was the result of teacher demand for more traditional texts, not any philosophical change of heart about the value of primary material. On the other hand, Kownslar's attention to basic academic skills was less the result of pressure for a "return to basics" than it was the product of his experiences in Pittsburgh.

The changes in Kownslar's texts chronicle the changes in emphases in social studies education in the last fifteen years and, above all else, the demise of "The New Social Studies." Ironically, Wiley and Race (1977) report separate 1977 studies which both reported that many social studies teachers claimed to use New Social Studies methods and materials. One of the authors, Richard Gross, concluded that the teacher's jargon had changed while their methods had stayed the same..

In all likelihood, the typical social studies teacher does use traditional lecture-discussion techniques most of the time, but they also discuss controversial issues, integrate social science concepts and methods, individualize to some extent, and attempt to make social studies relevant. Kownslar, through his recent texts, has appealed to the eclecticism in teachers. He has tried to produce texts that allow or stimulate both scientific and reflective inquiry, value clarification, and skill building while allowing teachers to use the methods with which they are most comfortable. Certainly this is more profitable, it may even be more pedagogically sound.

NOTES

[1] This anecdote and other items of personal information about Dr. Kownslar and his career were obtained through a series of interviews conducted by David Earle under the auspices of the History of Education Project of the Oral History Program at the University of Texas at Austin. Direct inquiries to Dr. O. L. Davis, Jr., Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Texas, Austin, Texas 78712.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Books

American Council of Learned Societies and the National Council for the Social Studies. The Social Studies and the Social Sciences. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1962.

Barr, Robert D., Joseph L. Barth, and S. Samuel Shermis. Defining the Social Studies, Bulletin 51, Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977.

Bestor, Arthur E. The Restoration of Learning. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1955.

Bruner, Jerome. The Process of Education. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Carpenter, Helen McCracken, ed. Skill Development in the Social Studies. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1963.

Cartwright, William H. and Richard L. Watson, eds. Interpreting and Teaching American History. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1961.

Ellsworth, Ruth and Ole Sand, eds. Improving the Social Studies Curriculum. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1955.

Fenton, Edwin. The New Social Studies. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1967.

Fenton, Edwin and Allan O. Kownslar, eds. The Americans. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Goodlad, John I. The Changing School Curriculum. New York: Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1966.

Haas, John D. The Era of the New Social Studies. Boulder, Colorado: Social Science Education Consortium, 1977. SO 009 662.

Judd, Barbara. Teacher's Guide for: A New History of the United States, an Inquiry Approach. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1969.

Kownslar, Allan O. Manifest Destiny and Expansionism in the 1840's. Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Co., 1967.

Kownslar, Allan O. The Progressive Era: Tradition in a Changing Society, 1900-1917. Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Co., 1970.

_____, ed. Teaching American History: The Quest for Relevancy. Washington, D.C.: National Countil for the Social Studies, 1974.

_____. The Texans, Their Land and History. New York: American Heritage Publishing Co., Inc., 1972.

_____ and Donald B. Frizzle. Discovering American History. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970.

_____ and Terry L. Smart. American Government. New York: McGraw Hill, 1980.

_____ and Terry L. Smart. People and Our World: A Study of World History. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Publishers, 1977.

Price, Roy A., ed. New Viewpoints in the Social Sciences. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1958.

Stake, Robert E. and Jack A. Easley. Case Studies in Science Education. Urbana-Champaign, Illinois: Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation and Committee on Culture and Cognition, 1978.

Wiley, Karen B. with Jeanne Race. The Status of Pre-College Science, Mathematics, and Social Science Education: 1955-1975, Volume III: Social Science Education, Boulder, Colorado: Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., 1977.

II. Articles

Chase, Francis P. "School Change in Perspective." in John I. Goodlad, ed., The Changing American School: The Sixty Fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966.

Engle, Shirley. "Thoughts in Regard to Revision," Social Education, XXVII (April, 1963), 182-184.

Fenton, Edwin and John M. Good. "Project Social Studies: A Progress Report," Social Education, XXIX (April, 1965), 206-208.

Keller, Charles. "Needed: Revolution in the Social Studies," Saturday Review. (September 16, 1961), 60-62.

Kownslar, Allan O. "The Status of History: Some Views and Suggestions" Social Education, XL (October, 1976) 447

_____ "What Should be Done to the Social Studies, A Response to 'What Have We Done to Social Studies,' " Southwestern Journal of Social Education, VI (Summer, 1974) p. 8-13.

Krug, Mark M., John B. Poster, and William B. Gillies, III. "On the Teaching of History" in The New Social Studies. Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1970, p. 176-182.

McCutcheon, Samuel P. "A Discipline for the Social Studies," Social Education, XVII (February, 1963), 61-65.

Robinson, Donald W. "Ferment in the Social Studies," Social Education, XXVII (November, 1963), 360-364.

Todd, Lewis Paul. "Afterward: Revising the Social Studies," in The Social Studies and the Social Sciences. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1962. pp. 282-303.